

Note on the Normalization of Predicted GRB Neutrino Flux

Zhuo Li

*Department of Astronomy/Kavli Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics,
Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
Key Laboratory for the Structure and Evolution of Celestial Objects,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming 650011, China*

We note that the theoretical prediction of neutrinos from gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) by IceCube overestimates the GRB neutrino flux, because they ignore both the energy dependence of the fraction of proton energy transferred to charged pions and the radiative energy loss of secondary pions and muons when calculating the normalization of the neutrino flux. After correction for these facts the GRB neutrino flux is reduced, e.g., by a factor ~ 5 for typical GRB spectral parameter, and may be consistent with the present zero event detected by IceCube. More observations are important to push the sensitivity below the prediction and test whether GRBs are the sources of ultra-high energy cosmic rays.

PACS numbers: 95.85.Ry, 14.60.Pq, 98.70.Rz, 98.70.Sa

IceCube has become the most sensitive TeV-scale neutrino telescope that may reach the predicted neutrino flux from gamma-ray bursts (GRBs). The continued non-detection in its 22 (IC22, [1]), 40 (IC40, [2]) and 59 (IC59 [3]) string configuration puts more and more stringent limits on GRB neutrino flux. The IC40 limit is comparable to the theoretical prediction [2], whereas the combined IC40 and IC59 limit is only 0.22 times the prediction [3]. These limits start to put interesting constraints on the GRB neutrino models of Waxman and Bahcall [4, 5] and Guetta et al. (2004) [6], and challenges GRBs as the sources of ultra-high energy cosmic rays (UHECRs). However, in this note we show that the approach that IceCube [1–3] takes in theoretical prediction is somewhat different from that of Waxman and Bahcall and Guetta et al. [4–6], leading to overestimate of GRB neutrino flux by a factor of ~ 5 for typical GRB parameters. This is because of ignoring the effects of the energy dependence of charged pion production and secondary pion/muon cooling on the normalization of neutrino flux.

The approach taken by IceCube papers [1–3] is presented in the appendix of the IC22 paper [1]. In their approach, the muon neutrino flux from a GRB, $\mathcal{F}_\nu$, (with neutrino oscillation the electron, muon and tau neutrinos roughly share equal energy [7]) is scaled to the proton flux in the GRB, $\mathcal{F}_p$, as

$$\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}}/\mathcal{F}_p = \frac{1}{8}f_{\pi,b} \quad (1)$$

(this comes from eq [A8] of [1]). Here $f_{\pi,b} \equiv f_\pi(E = E_b)$ is the fraction of energy of protons with E_b carried by charged pions, and E_b is the energy of protons that interact with photons with spectral-break energy ϵ_b at Δ resonance [4],

$$E_b = 1.3 \times 10^{16} \Gamma_{2.5}^2 \epsilon_{b,\text{MeV}}^{-1} \text{eV}, \quad (2)$$

where $\Gamma = 10^{2.5} \Gamma_{2.5}$ is the bulk Lorentz factor of the GRB, and $\epsilon_b = 1\epsilon_{b,\text{MeV}} \text{MeV}$. The $f_{\pi,b}$ value depends on the GRB properties, and varies from burst to burst (see eqs [A7] and [A8] of [1]). The factor 1/8 is due to the facts that one half of the $p\gamma$ interactions produce charged pions, and that each generated neutrino is assumed to carry one fourth of the secondary pion energy. The proton flux can be normalized to gamma-ray flux by $\mathcal{F}_p = (1/f_e)\mathcal{F}_\gamma$ where f_e is the ratio of accelerated proton to electron energy. In what follows we show that the approximation in eq (1) is different from the models of Waxman and Bahcall [4, 5] and Guetta et al [6], and leads to overestimate of the neutrino flux.

For a flat proton distribution with index $p \approx 2$ ($E^2 dn_p/dE \propto E^{2-p}$), and a typical GRB spectrum with Band-function parameters, $\alpha_\gamma = 1$ and $\beta_\gamma = 2$, $f_\pi(E) = f_{\pi,b}$ is valid for protons with $E > E_b$. However, for $E < E_b$, $f_\pi \propto E$ reduces with E decreasing because fewer target photons at high energy [4]. Thus by using $f_\pi(E) = f_{\pi,b}$ in energies $E < E_b$ eq. (1) overestimates the neutrino flux.

Moreover, eq. (1) also ignores the suppression of neutrino production at high energies due to the radiative cooling of secondary pions/muons[15]. The synchrotron cooling timescale is shorter than the secondary decay time at energies above the cooling energy [1, 5, 6],

$$E_{c,\pi/\mu} = 2 \times 10^{17} (\epsilon_e/\epsilon_B)^{1/2} \Gamma_{2.5}^4 \Delta t_{-2} L_{52}^{-1/2} \times \begin{cases} 1 & (\mu^\pm) \\ 10 & (\pi^\pm) \end{cases} \text{eV}. \quad (3)$$

Here $L = 10^{52} L_{52} \text{erg s}^{-1}$ is the GRB (isotropic) luminosity, $\Delta t = 10^{-2} \Delta t_{-2} \text{s}$ is the GRB variability time, and ϵ_e and ϵ_B are the fractions of internal energy carried by postshock electrons and magnetic field, respectively.

Thus the neutrino production is mainly contributed by protons with $E_b < E < E_c$, which is only a fraction of the total accelerated protons in energy. The distribution of the accelerated protons is expected to be a power law between the minimum and maximum energy. For mildly-relativistic GRB internal shocks, the minimum accelerated proton energy might be

$$E_{\min} \simeq \Gamma m_p c^2 = 3 \times 10^{11} \Gamma_{300} \text{eV}. \quad (4)$$

The maximum proton energy is determined by the limit of synchrotron cooling for typical GRB parameters [8],

$$E_{\max} = 2.5 \times 10^{20} \Gamma_{300}^{5/2} \Delta t_{-2}^{1/2} \epsilon_e^{1/4} \epsilon_B^{-1/4} g^{-1/2} L_{52}^{-1/4} \text{eV}, \quad (5)$$

where $g \gtrsim 1$ accounts for the uncertainty in particle acceleration time.

Since the neutrino production is mainly contributed by protons with $E_b < E < E_c$ where $f_\pi(E) = f_{\pi,b}$, the muon neutrino flux $\mathcal{F}_\nu$ is estimated to be

$$\mathcal{F}_\nu \approx \int_{E_b}^{E_c} \frac{1}{8} f_{\pi,b} E \frac{dn_p}{dE} dE = \frac{\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}}}{\mathcal{F}_p} \int_{E_b}^{E_c} E \frac{dn_p}{dE} dE \approx \mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}} \frac{\ln(E_c/E_b)}{\ln(E_{\max}/E_{\min})}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_p = \int_{E_{\min}}^{E_{\max}} E \frac{dn_p}{dE} dE$ and Eq (1) have been used, and the last equation holds for $p \approx 2$. Given $E_{\max}/E_{\min} \sim 10^9$ and $E_{c,\pi}/E_b \sim 10^2$, the correction to Eq (1) is a factor of $\mathcal{F}_\nu/\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}} \sim 0.22$.

Below is more detailed calculation about $\mathcal{F}_\nu/\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}}$. For a flat proton distribution, $p = 2$, and a GRB spectrum with Band-function parameters, α_γ , β_γ and ϵ_b , the source neutrino spectrum (before neutrino oscillation) is [1, 4–6], for muon neutrinos from secondary pion decay,

$$\frac{dn_{\nu_\mu}^\pi}{d\varepsilon} = n_0 \times \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_b}\right)^{-\alpha_\nu} & \varepsilon < \varepsilon_b \\ \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_b}\right)^{-\beta_\nu} & \varepsilon_b < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{c,\pi} \\ \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{c,\pi}}{\varepsilon_b}\right)^{-\beta_\nu} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{c,\pi}}\right)^{-(\beta_\nu+2)} & \varepsilon > \varepsilon_{c,\pi} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

for electron and muon neutrinos from secondary muon decay,

$$\frac{dn_{\nu_e}^\mu}{d\varepsilon} = \frac{dn_{\nu_\mu}^\mu}{d\varepsilon} = n_0 \times \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_b}\right)^{-\alpha_\nu} & \varepsilon < \varepsilon_b \\ \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_b}\right)^{-\beta_\nu} & \varepsilon_b < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{c,\mu} \\ \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{c,\mu}}{\varepsilon_b}\right)^{-\beta_\nu} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{c,\mu}}\right)^{-(\beta_\nu+2)} & \varepsilon_{c,\mu} < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{c,\pi} \\ \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{c,\mu}}{\varepsilon_b}\right)^{-\beta_\nu} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{c,\pi}}{\varepsilon_{c,\mu}}\right)^{-(\beta_\nu+2)} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{c,\pi}}\right)^{-(\beta_\nu+4)} & \varepsilon > \varepsilon_{c,\pi} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

There is no tau neutrino ν_τ generated in $p\gamma$ interactions, and the small effect of kaon production on neutrino flux is neglected. Here the power law indices are $\alpha_\nu = 3 - \beta_\gamma$ and $\beta_\nu = 3 - \alpha_\gamma$, and the normalization is

$$n_0 \equiv \frac{dn_\nu(\varepsilon = \varepsilon_b)}{d\varepsilon} = 50 f_{\pi,b} \frac{dn_p(E = E_b)}{dE}. \quad (9)$$

Note the factor $50 = \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{0.2}/0.05$ is resulted from the facts that (i) 1/2 of $p\gamma$ interactions produce charged pions; (ii) since the pion carries 0.2 of the proton energy, the muon neutrino number (after oscillation) per proton is $f_{\pi,b}/0.2$; and (iii) a single neutrino carries $0.2 \times \frac{1}{4} = 0.05$ of the proton energy, $\varepsilon_b = 0.05 E_b$. Similarly, we assume the other break energies in the neutrino spectrum, $\varepsilon_{c,\pi} \approx 0.05 E_{c,\pi}$, and $\varepsilon_{c,\mu} \approx 0.05 E_{c,\mu}$.

Considering neutrino oscillation, the muon neutrino spectrum (including ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$) detected on the Earth is approximated as [7]

$$\frac{dn_{\nu_\mu}^\oplus}{d\varepsilon} \approx 0.2 \frac{dn_{\nu_e}}{d\varepsilon} + 0.4 \frac{dn_{\nu_\mu}}{d\varepsilon} + 0.4 \frac{dn_{\nu_\tau}}{d\varepsilon} = 0.2 \frac{dn_{\nu_e}^\mu}{d\varepsilon} + 0.4 \left(\frac{dn_{\nu_\mu}^\pi}{d\varepsilon} + \frac{dn_{\nu_\mu}^\mu}{d\varepsilon} \right). \quad (10)$$

Note here $dn_{\nu_\tau}/d\varepsilon = 0$ since no tau neutrino produced. The muon neutrino flux is calculated as

$$\mathcal{F}_\nu/\mathcal{F}_p = \frac{\int_{0.05 E_{\min}}^{0.05 E_{\max}} \varepsilon (dn_{\nu_\mu}^\oplus/d\varepsilon) d\varepsilon}{\int_{E_{\min}}^{E_{\max}} E (dn_p/dE) dE}. \quad (11)$$

For various values of GRB spectral parameters, α_γ , β_γ and ϵ_b , we calculate the value of $\mathcal{F}_\nu/\mathcal{F}_p$ with eqs. (7-11), and show the $\mathcal{F}_\nu/\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}}$ value in Table I. We find that the approximation of eq (1) overestimates GRB neutrino flux by a few. Typically for GRBs with $\alpha_\gamma = 1$, $\beta_\gamma = 2$, and $\epsilon_b^{\text{obs}} = \epsilon_b/(1+z) = 0.2$ MeV, the correction factor is $\mathcal{F}_\nu/\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}} = 0.2$, i.e., the neutrino flux is overestimated by a factor of 5 in [1–3].

Note the neutrino spectrum used here (eqs. 7 and 8) is different from the one by IceCube papers [1–3] at high energy; they assume a simple steepening $dn_\nu^{\text{ob}}/d\varepsilon \propto \varepsilon^{-(\beta_\nu+2)}$ at $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_{c,\mu}$ (see eq. [A3] in IC22 paper [1]), which underestimate the neutrino emission from pion decay. Using their spectral shape, the neutrino flux is even smaller than using ours, thus the correction factor is even smaller.

TABLE I: The value of $\mathcal{F}_\nu/\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}}$ for various spectral parameter values.

α_γ	1	0.5	1.5	1	1	1	1
β_γ	2	2	2	1.5	3	2	2
$\epsilon_b^{\text{obs}}/\text{MeV}$	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.05	2
$\mathcal{F}_\nu/\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}}$	0.20	0.12	0.56	0.25	0.18	0.14	0.30

Note—The other parameters are $\Gamma = 300$, $\Delta t = 10^{-2}\text{s}$, $L = 10^{52}\text{erg s}^{-1}$, $z = 1.5$ and $E_{\text{max}} = 10^{21}\text{eV}$. The redshift z only has effect on the GRB spectral break, $\epsilon_b = \epsilon_b^{\text{obs}}(1+z)$.

In summary, for a flat energy distribution of accelerated protons in GRBs, $p \approx 2$, the predicted neutrino flux using eq (1), so as the approach taken by [1–3], is overestimated by a factor of $\mathcal{F}_\nu^{\text{IC}}/\mathcal{F}_\nu$, typically ~ 5 , compared to the models by [4–6]. So the IC40 limit of neutrino flux [2] actually should be above the prediction after correction, while the combined IC40 and IC59 limit, which is claimed to be 0.22 times of the prediction [3], could be consistent with the correct prediction.

Some comments should be made here. In this brief note we point out that when trying to test the models of [4–6] with data, the IceCube papers [1–3] actually take an approach different from the former models in calculating the neutrino flux, leading to overestimate. However, the models of [4–6] consider only Δ resonance and neglect the multi-pion production [9, 10], the kaon production [11] and the possible secondary particle acceleration [12]. All these facts may increase the neutrino flux and somewhat compensate the overestimate. It is also worth mentioning that if UHECRs are produced by the decay of neutrons that escape from the GRB outflow, it is straightforward to relate the neutrino flux with the observed UHECR flux, and avoid the uncertainties in parameters, e.g., f_π and f_e [13]. If the assumption that only neutrons escape is true, the neutrino flux will also increase.

Finally it should be stressed that there are large uncertainties in the GRB neutrino models, which may cause lower f_π and hence lower neutrino flux, e.g., larger emission size or larger bulk Lorentz factor. More observations by IceCube are required to push the sensitivity below the uncertainties [14], and test the assumption of GRBs as the UHECR sources.

The author thanks the anonymous referees for valuable comments. This work is partly supported by the Foundation for the Authors of National Excellent Doctoral Dissertations of China and the Open Research Program of Key Laboratory for the Structure and Evolution of Celestial Objects, Chinese Academy of Sciences.

-
- [1] Abbasi, R., Abdou, Y., Abu-Zayyad, T., et al. *Astrophys. J.*, **710**, 346 (2010)
 - [2] Abbasi, R., Abdou, Y., Abu-Zayyad, T., et al. *Physical Review Letters*, **106**, 141101 (2011)
 - [3] Redl, P. (IceCube Collaboration.), et al. In *Proc. of 32nd ICRC, Beijing, China, 2011*.
 - [4] Waxman, E., & Bahcall, J. *Physical Review Letters*, **78**, 2292 (1997)
 - [5] Waxman, E., & Bahcall, J. *Phys. Rev. D*, **59**, 023002 (1999)
 - [6] Guetta, D., Hooper, D., Alvarez-Mun˜ız, J., Halzen, F., & Reuveni, E. *Astroparticle Physics*, **20**, 429 (2004)
 - [7] Particle Data Group, *Physics Letters B*, **592**, 1 (2004)
 - [8] Waxman, E. *Physical Review Letters*, **75**, 386 (1995)
 - [9] Murase, K., & Nagataki, S. *Phys. Rev. D*, **73**, 063002 (2006)
 - [10] Baerwald, P., Hümmer, S., & Winter, W. *Phys. Rev. D*, **83**, 067303 (2011)
 - [11] Asano, K., & Nagataki, S. *ApJ*, **640**, L9 (2006)
 - [12] Koers, H. B. J., & Wijers, R. A. M. J. 2007, arXiv:0711.4791
 - [13] Ahlers, M., Gonzalez-Garcia, M. C., & Halzen, F. *Astroparticle Physics*, **35**, 87 (2011)
 - [14] Baerwald, P., Hümmer, S., & Winter, W. 2011, arXiv:1107.5583
 - [15] It is possible that the secondaries get accelerated before cooling. However the Fermi shock acceleration requires the (far)downstream secondaries catch up with and cross the (mildly) relativistic shock, which may be of low probability and is ignored here.